

## REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated December 28, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above amendments and the following remarks.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-3, 7-9 and 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over OGSi in view of Brown. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

In applying the references, the Examiner notes that OGSi fails to teach “comparing said OGSA container attribute to a characteristic of said OGSA container; supporting said OGSA service on said OGSA container when said attribute matches said characteristic.” The Examiner relies on Brown as allegedly teaching these features and cites to paragraphs [0018], [0036] and [0039] along with Figure 3 of Brown. Brown teaches web service containers that receive web service software modules to perform certain functions. Paragraph [0018] describes a scenario where a web service container is configured to act as a service router. Paragraph [0036] discusses container discovery process between two containers. Paragraph [0039] describes use of registries to keep track of containers in an environment, including updating registries when a container is added or removed. None of the sections of Brown cited by the Examiner teach “comparing said OGSA container attribute to a characteristic of said OGSA container; supporting said OGSA service on said OGSA container when said attribute matches said characteristic” as recited in claim 1. Thus, even if OGSi and Brown are combined, the features of claim 1 do not result.

Further, the features of claims 2 and 3 have been added to claim 1. In the analysis of claim 3, the Examiner relies on OGSi and states that OGSi teaches generating an error message when said attribute does not match said characteristic as “an error is generated when the instance is created” on pages 23-24 of OGSi. OGSi teaches generating an error when the number of values is either less than the value of minOccurs or greater than the value of maxOccurs (page 24). The error in OGSi has nothing to do with whether a OGSA container attribute matches a characteristic of a OGSA container. Thus, even if OGSi and Brown are combined, the features of claim 1 do not result.

In the analysis of claim 2 the Examiner cites to paragraph [0093] as allegedly teaching “reconfiguring said OGSA container when said attribute does not match said characteristic to support said OGSA service” as now recited in claim 1. Brown fails to teach

this feature. Brown teaches a web container reconfiguring itself to a router, but fails to teach the claimed condition for the reconfiguring. That is, claim 1 recites “reconfiguring said OGSA container **when said attribute does not match said characteristic** to support said OGSA service.” This aspect is completely lacking in Brown. Thus, even if OGSI and Brown are combined, the features of claim 1 do not result.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 is patentable over OGSI in view of Brown. Claims 7 and 13 include features similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 1 and are patentable over OGSI in view of Brown for at least the same reasons.

Claims 4, 5, 10, 11, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over OGSI in view of Brown and Java. Java was relied upon for allegedly disclosing a user interface and identifying a port of a grid resource to support OGSI instance, but fails to cure the deficiencies of OGSI in view of Brown discussed above with reference to claims 1, 7 and 13. Claims 4 and 5 depend from claim 1, claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 7 and claims 16 and 17 depend from claim 13.

Claims 6, 12 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over OGSI in view of Brown and Wilding-McBride. Wilding-McBride was relied upon for allegedly disclosing a tool to undeploy an OGSA service, but fails to cure the deficiencies of OGSI in view of Brown discussed above with reference to claims 1, 7 and 13. Claim 6 depends from claim 1, claim 12 depends from claim 7 and claim 18 depends from claim 13.

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicants submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 09-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David A. Fox  
Registration No. 38,807  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
20 Church Street, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Hartford, CT 06103-3207  
Telephone (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile (860) 286-0115  
Customer No. 46429

Date: April 28, 2008